DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink on page 1. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink. See MPEP § 608.01.

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 7-10 are objected to because of the following informality:

Re claims 7-10, line 1, "The storage control apparatus" should read - - The storage apparatus - -.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a computer program, which is non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vlodavsky et al (US 20030161327), hereinafter referred to as Vlodavsky, in view of Liu et al (US 5530703), hereinafter referred to as Liu.

Re claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17 and 20, Vlodavsky discloses registering information about an attribute of packets that are receivable corresponding to a command; acquiring information about an attribute of the packet received (paragraph [0023]), but fails to disclose execute, upon occurrence of a reception error that there is no information (packet type in claims 2, 7, 12 and 17) in the attribute registering unit corresponding to the information acquired by the attribute acquiring unit, a predetermined reception error handling routine according to a type of the reception error. Liu discloses discarding a packet if the packet type does not match in filtering process performed in a processor (executing a part of the reception error handling routine as a firmware process executed by a microcomputer, column 10, lines 53-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

system of Vlodavsky with the teaching of Liu in abandoning a packet with a packet type not in the system for the benefit of providing secure network communication.

Claim 3, 8, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vlodavsky in view of Liu and further in view of Gupta et al (US 7027394), hereinafter referred to as Gupta.

Re claims 3, 8, 13 and 18, Vlodavsky discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to disclose abandoning the packet received upon occurrence of a reception error that there is no information about the length of the packet in the attribute registering unit corresponding to the information about the length of the packet acquired by the attribute acquiring unit. Gupta discloses discarding a packet if the packet length does not match a given packet length (column 30, lines 31-33). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Vlodavsky with the teaching of Gupta in abandoning a packet with a different packet length in the system for the benefit of providing secure network communication.

Claim 4, 9, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vlodavsky in view of Liu and further in view of Ptasinski et al (US 20020041570), hereinafter referred to as Ptasinski.

Re claims 4, 9, 14 and 19, Vlodavsky discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to disclose abandoning the packet received upon occurrence of a reception error that there is no information about the sequence of receiving of the packet in the

attribute registering unit corresponding to the information about the sequence of receiving of the packet acquired by the attribute acquiring unit. Ptasinski discloses discarding a packet if the sequence number does not match a given sequence number (paragraph [0227], lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Vlodavsky with the teaching of Ptasinski in abandoning a packet with a sequence number not in the system for the benefit of providing secure network communication.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Cho whose telephone number is 571-272-3087. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri during 7 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hong Cho/

Hong Cho
Patent Examiner
6/12/2008